



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ordered a copy to be made. Cf. KELLE, 'Die St. Galler deutschen Schriften und Notker Labeo.' This copy too is missing, but an apograph of it was made for SCHILTER and edited in his 'Thesaurus' by JOANNES FRICKIUS. From this apograph the Dane ROSTGAARD made a copy (=R), now in the royal library at Copenhagen, and compared it with LA LOUBERE's text.

In the second chapter, "Zur Übersetzung der Psalmen NOTKER's," KELLE proves: first, that the translations of the 'Psalms,' of 'De cons.,' 'De nupt.' and 'De cat.' are by the same author; second, that the interlinear glossaries which are found in SG and R cannot be, on account of their dialect peculiarities, the work of NOTKER himself.

In the third part, "Zur Grammatik der Psalmen Notkers," KELLE gives a detailed grammar of the verb, the noun and the adjective in NOTKER's 'Psalms'; and a record of the variant forms occurring in NOTKER's other works, makes these chapters complete for all his works.

KELLE does not undertake to treat the pronouns and numerals separately, but will study the peculiarities of their use in NOTKER's works in another treatise, 'Lautlehre der Notkerschen Sprache,' soon to be published.

MAX POLL.

*Harvard University.*

### RUDYARD KIPLING AND CLEARNESS.

No teacher of practical rhetoric remains long ignorant of the fact that many of the statements of the best text-books are hardly more than ideals. As such they possibly do less harm than good, but now and then he is startled by the amount of discretion entrusted to him—perhaps a more accurate phrasing would put it, imposed upon him. For a number of years my attention has been called to the difficulty of squaring the orthodox rules on clearness with the successful practice of writers of all grades. Critics as well as teachers are familiar with the rich embroidery of MILTON's unfamiliar geography and unknown heroes, and an easy explanation is usually found in the pleasure conferred upon

the ear of the reader, in whatever need of notes his understanding may be. Few students have not been exasperated by EMERSON's elusive references and allusions, and for a fair proportion of them, I fancy, no reasonable explanation can be found on ordinary rhetorical principles.

The difficulty in dealing with this question lies in the fact that it is almost impossible to secure what scientists call an isolated instance. Illustration that by no stretch of the imagination can be made to illustrate, and examples that exemplify only after a deduction that would do honor to KANT, are so inextricably interwoven with the other factors that have made the whole style subtle, vigorous or charming, that they not only escape blame but often get part of the credit. In work of this sort, too, the professional judgment is almost the only one that can be procured, because the ordinary reader either attributes his lack of interest to his own culpable stupidity, or accounts for his interest by the impeccable perfection of his author. The professional critic is open to the objection applicable to any expert. He is sophisticated. He has cultivated a taste for rebuses. He does not know them as such half the time when he sees them and, ten to one, when he does, he likes them for the easy sense of power they afford him.

The works of SHAKESPEARE, MILTON, CARLYLE, MEREDITH and BROWNING, because they are classics or the property of a cult, or for some other of the unsatisfactory but thoroughly disqualifying reasons existing in such connections, do not serve the purpose of the teacher or the philosophical critic. He must find something that plain people enjoy and that they are not afraid to talk about. RUDYARD KIPLING's stories afford an excellent case in point. Making all due allowance for the fact that they have been somewhat the fashion, people have had a most genuine enjoyment out of them. It is noticeable, however, that nearly every reader has thought their appeal likely to be peculiar to himself, and has been surprised when he found his neighbor enjoying them quite as well. KIPLING affords extraordinary facilities for discovery, judging from the number of people

who fancy that they have discovered him. Allowance, too, must be made for the charm of the story-teller. In these days of overwrought analysis, readers will endure much for the sake of a story that never ceases to be about something. And the plain reader without the 'Imperial Dictionary' or even with all the numbers of the 'Century' beside him, has a good deal to bear. What is a *pipal*, why has it a crook, and does it always overhang? One's memory of BURNS, helped out by the context, removes the necessity of further inquiry for the meaning of *cutty*, the 'Imperial' sets one at rest about a *nullah*, but a *ruction* remains as problematical as the big *Sisham*, or the exact way *Gonds* stand when they meditate. These examples have been taken at random from one volume of LOVELL'S reprint. They are by no means the blindest nor the most elaborate of their kind. Words darken counsel most when the natives talk about horses, their treatment and equipage. But the point to which I wish to call attention is, that while nobody fails to appreciate this element of the unfamiliar and the unknown, nobody resents it very bitterly, and a few are bold enough to declare that it is a distinct factor in their pleasure. Assuming these few to be faithful and competent recorders of their own experience, three hypotheses are possible for its explanation. First, that these stories are the result of a most careful and perfect adjustment to a certain class of readers, although not to the ones under discussion. That the pleasure of the latter is due to an intuitive perception of this adjustment and response to it as far as is possible, combined with the anticipation of further pleasure when circumstances render the response complete. In other words, there are persons in England and India to whom the expression of these stories is charming for its familiarity, for its perfect intelligibility, who laugh and cry "for old sake's sake," instead of at what we call the freshness of it. This supposition is borne out by the careful way in which KIPLING treats references and allusions bearing even in the remotest way upon scholastic interests. He translates the commonplaces of science and philosophy, apparently to keep within range of somebody's understanding—possibly, how-

ever, for the sake of a certain vivacity thereby imparted to his handling of well-worn topics. This supposition requires no important modification of the ordinary rhetorical canons. It is in effect to say, "Choose your audience, and if it consist of but one man, make your meaning perfectly clear to him and you will have succeeded; other men will share his pleasure in proportion as they share his intelligence; the rest of the world are your readers at their peril."

Second, that the adjustment was at no time perfect, nor ever aimed to be. That the author worked always with his eye on the object rather than on the audience, and would have enjoyed the creature of his own fancy if no other mortal had ever spoken well of it. That he was pushed on from point to point in his work by the desire to embody a certain ideal that he could never make clear because it was never clear to him. It was simply impelling. In this effort some elements produced form by their combination, others did not. In one case he succeeded, in the other he failed. His success or failure in either case would be independent of his audience. Their pleasure would depend upon: first, their ability to share his interest in the ideal; second, his power to maintain the impression of form in their minds. A careful analysis of KIPLING'S literary method bears out this view. His use of the unfamiliar is not mechanical, but organic. He does not explain his diction, references and allusions as MACAULAY does, nor as most so-called rhetoricians of the careful type do. On the other hand, there is at certain points an essential difference between his obscurity and that of EMERSON, MEREDITH or BROWNING, and an essential similarity at others. The plain reader, perhaps, would make no distinction here, but see always an essential difference in that he would be able to follow KIPLING, while the others he would eventually give up in discouragement. But without going into any discussion of the other authors, it is not to be denied that even in the particular cases cited from KIPLING'S stories there is a difference in the way the foreign element is used, and a corresponding difference in the resulting impression. Judged by any standard of comparison, the side-conversation in 'With

the Main Guard' between Ortheris and Mulvaney where the word *ruction* is used, is not as happily nor as forcibly managed as most such episodes by KIPLING. That this difference is due to something besides the mere character of the adjustment to the reader's comprehension, is clear from a consideration of the fact that the words themselves are all equally familiar or unfamiliar. But nobody fails to recognize (though unconsciously perhaps) the presence of outward form indicating the influence of an organizing idea behind it wherever it exists. In this regard CHARLES DARWIN'S struggles to write clearly, as described by himself, when considered in connection with the resulting style, point to a like conclusion. The nonsense verses of LEWIS CARROLL owe their charm to the skill with which the form is maintained in the incongruous material. They are nonsense, perhaps, but nearly everybody tries to make them sense, an influence by no means common to all forms of the unintelligible. Moreover, the value of nonsense fluctuates in accordance with its possession of this quality. Some of it is "delicious," some of it, and by far the greater part, only tiresome. Tiresome nonsense and tiresome sense will be found to be possessed of formal elements singularly alike. Not to be led too far away from the main subject of investigation, this second hypothesis calls for a very considerable modification and elaboration of the ordinary rhetorical exposition of clearness. A sharper distinction needs to be made between the ideal and the mechanical elements in expression, and a more careful allotment of their provinces. It will be seen that the essential character of so-called ornament has been largely misunderstood, and that it needs more careful analysis; that the distinction between the processes of invention and of reproduction has been sharply made and too broadly insisted upon.

Third, it may be that the unintelligible is of right a distinct source of pleasure, that it is, whether we recognize it or not, a latent factor in all expression, and that we err in not taking account of it. For so general a principle as this, I find no evidence of the formal sort in KIPLING. But it is worthy of passing notice that the least as well as the most highly cul-

tured members of society agree in their enjoyment of what is beyond their comprehension. It is almost invariably a middle class, that live by the letter, who resent its appearance and disbelieve its *de jure* existence. CAMPBELL, I believe, is the only formal rhetorician who has given the meaningless any extended notice. He, however, does not elevate it to a positive factor of expression. At most, he treats of it as escaping censure and ridicule by its relative character. In other words, he forces it to seek the protection of the reader for whom it will have meaning and so be subject to all the considerations of adjustment—our first hypothesis.

My observation leads me to believe that the majority of persons hold one or both of the positions last described. Many of them hesitate to take the bold step of acknowledging an interest for which they cannot fully account. For such there are nearly always conventional beauties that may be praised, and safe virtues to be commended. It was not one of these who said the other day, in reply to a question, "Of course I don't understand half of it. But I enjoy it, just as I enjoy being pulled along by an express train through a perfectly foreign country; and I want it distinctly understood that I don't travel for the sake of the things that other nations have in common with us, but for their differences."

Granting even a modicum of truth in the foregoing analysis, the practical question still remains, How far is it safe to admit the difficult, the unfamiliar, the unintelligible into a process, one (at least) of whose uses is to serve as a means of communication? The formal rhetorician probably will not admit the propriety of the question even. They are all to be removed in the interests of the reader. But the verdict is a hasty one, and involves a principle fatal to the production of the best work. Adjustment to the reader is at best a secondary consideration and ultimately involves, when elevated to a principle, the admitted failure to attain the highest merit. Masterpieces make their appeal directly, and can neither be produced by rule nor explained by precept. That they do not offend against either is true, because the greater includes the less. The best is never too good for the

crowd. May it not be questioned, then, whether the elevation of adjustment to the importance of a principle is much more than a practical device for finding out what particular kind of badness will be endured?

M. A. JORDAN.

*Smith College.*

### THE INVENTOR OF THE ENGLISH HEXAMETER.

Among the unfortunates whose names have been handed down to literary obloquy, perhaps none has been more the victim of circumstances than Dr. GABRIEL HARVEY. A grave and really learned man of a somewhat irritable and testy disposition, he was guilty of two false steps in denying his own humble origin and in refusing to let the grave protect a paltry foe from the lash of his revenge. No one can doubt that the Doctor richly deserved the tremendous trouncing which he received at the hands of the irrepressible author of 'Have with you to Saffron Walden'; but those who prefer the truth to the brilliant satire and invective of THOMAS NASHE, the biased narrative of D'ISRAELI, or even the prejudiced representations of Dr. GROSART, should turn to Professor MORLEY's interesting essay, entitled "Spenser's Hobbino!" (*Fortnightly Rev.* xi, pp. 274-283) for a general vindication, which, however, strangely enough omits to answer one of the chief counts of the indictment.

A reference to any average text-book on English Literature, if it be sufficiently full to warrant a mention of him, will disclose that HARVEY was the inventor of the English hexameter, or at least boasted himself to be such, or desired only to be so epitaphed. Whereupon much rhetoric is bestowed upon the absurdity of the hexameter, the inventor, and the boast; and the friend of SPENSER is forthwith dubbed "a fantastical pedant" and wicked seducer of SIDNEY and SPENSER from the paths of poetic rectitude into the stony ways of classical metres in English verse.

Turning to the authorities, we meet with the same charges based upon the same statement of HARVEY's supposed words. Here are some of them:

"Gabriel Harvey desired only to be 'epitaphed' the inventor of the English hexameter."<sup>1</sup>

"He [Harvey] boasted himself the inventor and introducer of English hexameter."<sup>2</sup>

"If I never deserve any better remembrance," he exclaims in one of his pamphlets, 'let me be epitaphed the inventor of the English hexameter.'"<sup>3</sup>

"Hence the following egotistical boast in one of his wordy contests with Nashe: If I never, etc. . . . let me be epitaphed, etc."<sup>4</sup>

"Harvey, Spenser's friend, was one of the chief patrons, if not the inventor of the English hexameter."<sup>5</sup>

"If I never deserve, etc. . . . let me be epitaphed the Inventor of the English Hexameter."<sup>6</sup>

Even Mr. ARBER, who quotes more correctly than the older authorities, does not finish the passage and hence gives it the same coloring; thus:

"If I neuer deserue anye better remembrance, let mee rather be epitaphed the Inventor of the English Hexameter: whom learned M. Standihurst imitated in his Virgill, and excellent Sir Philip Sidney disdained not to follow in his *Arcadia* and elsewhere."<sup>7</sup>

And Dr. GROSART, HARVEY's latest editor, shows that he prefers the interpretation of the critics to his author's own words, by this exclamation, which can be based alone on the above curtailed and garbled quotation of the original passage.

"None but a 'fantastic pedant' could have insisted on experiment so nonsensical, and none but a man blinded by 'vanity' could so have boasted of being the Inventor of Hexameter."<sup>8</sup>

I shall give the passage entire and in its context, that we may have before us the original of this curious misquotation.

"It goeth somewhat hard in my harsh Legend, when the father of Musicke must be mocked, not Tubalcain, as he mistearemeth him, but Tuball, whom Genesis voutsafeth honourable mention: and the Hexameter

1. Dr. FARMER's "Essay on the Learning of Sh." MALONE's 'Sh.' i. p. 327.

2. DRAKE, 'Sh. and his Times,' i, 457.

3. CRAIK, 'Sketch of the History of Literature and Learning in England,' iii, p. 63.

4. BRYDGES 'Censura Litteraria,' i, p. 402.

5. WARTON, 'History of English Poetry,' iii, p. 324.

6. *ibid.*, note by PARK.

7. STANDIHURST's 'First four books of Virgil,' ARBER's 'English Scholar's Library' No. 10, p. vii.

8. 'Works of HARVEY,' ed. GROSART, Introd. i, p. xlviii.